

## Remarks

The present amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on November 03, 2006, made final. Claims 29-36 are standing for examination. Claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sassin et al. (US 6,058,435) hereinafter Sassin. Claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sassin.

In response to the Examiner's rejections and statements, applicant herein amends the independent claims to particularly point out the order of building skill sets including the task and all available agents. Applicant also provides arguments which clearly show that Sassin fails to teach or suggest all of applicant's claim limitations.

Applicant wishes to address the Examiner's "Response to Arguments" portion of the Office Action. The Examiner states; "*Applicant argues that 'the skills required for servicing the call are determined from the incoming communication then building a resume table of available agents and organizing the skill table'. Examiner respectfully submits that there is nowhere in the claims that recite building resume table of available agents in response to the incoming communication.*

*Applicant argues that 'creating a table of all of the agents that are a best match for servicing the task'. Again, Examiner respectfully submits that there is nowhere in the claims that recite creating a table of all of the agents. "*

Applicant herein amends the independent claims to include; "means for building a skill table of all available agents at least partially based on the skill set determined to be best suited to service the task." Applicant also amended the method claim 29 to include labeled steps a-d to more particularly point out the order of the steps.

Applicant argues that it is critically important to determine the skill set required to service the task *before* determining the skill set of all available agents, wherein the agent skill set is built at least partially based upon the skill set determined to service the task. Only with the claimed system can the proper organization and data processing occur to determine the best agent to service the task. In this manner the skills required are known

before the table is generated to facilitate finding the best agent without doing a complete database search of every agent as in the art of Sassin.

Further applicant argues that the independent claims specifically recite creating a table of all of the agents that are a best match for servicing the task. Sassin specifically teaches selecting individual agents from the database based on a skill resume for each agent and the agent is selected having at least a specific number associated with servicing the task (col. 9, line 51 to col. 10, line 1). Sassin creates the table for each individual agent before a task is recognized for servicing or responding to (see Sassin Fig. 3). Sassin fails to teach a collective skill table of all available agents as claimed.

Applicant argues that Sassin fails to teach all of limitations recited in applicant's independent claims; therefore the 102 rejection fails as a prima facie case of anticipation has not been shown. Applicant believes claims 29, 31, 33 and 35 are clearly patentable over the art of Sassin. Claims 30, 32, 34 and 36 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended upon a patentable claim.

As all of the claims have been shown to be patentable over the art of record, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that the case be passed quickly to issue. If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Joseph B. Agusta

By Donald R. Boys  
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.  
3 Hangar Way, Suite D  
Watsonville, CA 95076  
831-768-1755